

6

Appl. No. 10/726,309
Docket No. 9454
Amdt. dated 6/20/06
Reply to Office Action mailed on 3/24/06
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-17 are cancelled without prejudice as redundant in view of the amendments to Claim 1.

New Claim 21 reciting the concave bottom has been added. Basis is found at page 5, line 25.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the region of deflection (added by the previous responsive amendment) has less resistance to flexing than does the body of the container proximate to said region of deflection. Basis is found at page 9, line 13 (to allow "flexion") and last paragraph.

It is submitted that all amendments are fully supported and entry is requested.

Claims 1-14 and 18-21 are now under consideration.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-5, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected over US 6,733,803 in view of The Encyclopedia of Polymer Science and Technology and in further view of US 3,944,127, for reasons of record at page 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 1-7, 11-14 and 17-20 stand rejected over '127 and Encyclopedia, for reasons of record at page 3 of the Office Action..

Claims 8-10 stand rejected over '127 in view of Encyclopedia and US 4,890,752, for reasons of record at page 3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections, to the extent they may apply to the claims as now amended. All previous remarks and arguments in support of patentability continue to apply, but will not be exhaustively repeated herein for the sake of brevity.

In a nutshell, Applicants' position is that none of the cited documents suggests the "region of deflection" employed in the present containers. In response, the Examiner (Office Action, page 3) surmises that the "region of deflection" could encompass the reinforcing ribs of '803, since no flexibility requirement is given.

7

Appl. No. 10/726,309
Docket No. 9454
Amdt. dated 6/20/06
Reply to Office Action mailed on 3/24/06
Customer No. 27752

In response to that position, the claims have now been amended to recite that the region of deflection has less resistance to flexing that does the proximate region of the container, i.e., is more flexible. This, of course, is the exact opposite of a reinforcing rib.


It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited documents, or combinations thereof, suggests this key feature of the present invention, which is common to all claims now under consideration. This, taken with the matters previously discussed, fully meets all grounds for rejection set-forth by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections are requested.

In light of the foregoing, early and favorable action on the amended claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By


Jerry L. Yetter
Registration No. 26,598
(513) 627-2996

Date: June 20, 2006
Customer No. 27752